

Instructions for Using the Plan Review Crosswalk for Review of Local Mitigation Plans

Attached is a Plan Review Crosswalk based on the *Multi-Hazard Mitigation Planning Guidance Under the Disaster Mitigation Act of 2000*, published by FEMA, dated March 2004. This Plan Review Crosswalk is consistent with the *Disaster Mitigation Act of 2000* (P.L. 106-390), enacted October 30, 2000 and *44 CFR Part 201 – Mitigation Planning, Interim Final Rule* (the Rule), published February 26, 2002.

SCORING SYSTEM

N – Needs Improvement: The plan does not meet the minimum for the requirement. Reviewer's comments must be provided.

S – Satisfactory: The plan meets the minimum for the requirement. Reviewer's comments are encouraged, but not required.

Each requirement includes separate elements. All elements of a requirement must be rated "Satisfactory" in order for the requirement to be fulfilled and receive a summary score of "Satisfactory." A "Needs Improvement" score on elements shaded in gray (recommended but not required) will not preclude the plan from passing.

When reviewing single jurisdiction plans, reviewers may want to put an N/A in the boxes for multi-jurisdictional plan requirements. When reviewing multi-jurisdictional plans, reviewers may want to put an N/A in the prerequisite box for single jurisdiction plans.

States that have additional requirements can add them in the appropriate sections of the *Multi-Hazard Mitigation Planning Guidance* or create a new section and modify this Plan Review Crosswalk to record the score for those requirements.

Optional matrices for assisting in the review of sections on profiling hazards, assessing vulnerability, and identifying and analyzing mitigation actions are found at the end of the Plan Review Crosswalk.

The example below illustrates how to fill in the Plan Review Crosswalk.

Example

Assessing Vulnerability: Overview

Requirement §201.6(c)(2)(ii): *[The risk assessment shall include a] description of the jurisdiction's vulnerability to the hazards described in paragraph (c)(2)(i) of this section. This description shall include an overall summary of each hazard and its impact on the community.*

Element	Location in the Plan (section or annex and page #)	Reviewer's Comments	SCORE	
			N	S
A. Does the plan include an overall summary description of the jurisdiction's vulnerability to each hazard?	Section II, pp. 4-10	The plan describes the types of assets that are located within geographically defined hazard areas as well as those that would be affected by winter storms.		✓
B. Does the plan address the impact of each hazard on the jurisdiction?	Section II, pp. 10-20	The plan does not address the impact of two of the five hazards addressed in the plan. Required Revisions: • Include a description of the impact of floods and earthquakes on the assets. Recommended Revisions: • This information can be presented in terms of dollar value or percentages of damage.	✓	
SUMMARY SCORE			✓	

Jurisdiction: **WIBAUX COUNTY, MONTANA**

Local Mitigation Plan Review and Approval Status

Jurisdiction: Wibaux County	Title of Plan: Wibaux County Community Wildfire Protection/PDM Plan	Date of Plan: December 2005
Local Point of Contact: Frank V. Datta	Address: P.O. Box 336 Wibaux, MT 59353	
Title: Wibaux County Disaster and Emergency Services Director		
Agency: Wibaux County		
Phone Number: 406-796-2218	E-Mail: wibaux@midrivers.com	

State Reviewer: Kent Atwood	Title: SHMO	Date: June 23, 2006
--------------------------------	----------------	------------------------

FEMA Reviewer: Wade Nofziger Ken Crawford Jennifer Fee	Title: Hazard Mitigation Program Specialist Hazard Mitigation Program Specialist Planner	Date: June 30, 2006 August 4, 2006 July 7, 2006
Date Received in FEMA Region VIII	June 27, 2006	
Plan Not Approved		
Plan Approved	XXXX	
Date Approved	August 21, 2006	

Jurisdiction:	NFIP Status*			
	Y	N	N/A	CRS Class
1. Wibaux County (suspended – mapped 2/18/98)		X		
2. Town of Wibaux (Good Standing – mapped 2/18/98)	X			

* Notes:

Y = Participating

N = Not Participating

N/A = Not Mapped

LOCAL MITIGATION PLAN REVIEW SUMMARY

The plan cannot be approved if the plan has not been formally adopted.

Each requirement includes separate elements. All elements of the requirement must be rated "Satisfactory" in order for the requirement to be fulfilled and receive a score of "Satisfactory." Elements of each requirement are listed on the following pages of the Plan Review Crosswalk. A "Needs Improvement" score on elements shaded in gray (recommended but not required) will not preclude the plan from passing. Reviewer's comments must be provided for requirements receiving a "Needs Improvement" score.

SCORING SYSTEM

Please check one of the following for each requirement.

N – Needs Improvement: The plan does not meet the minimum for the requirement.
Reviewer's comments must be provided.

S – Satisfactory: The plan meets the minimum for the requirement. Reviewer's comments are encouraged, but not required.

Prerequisite(s) (Check Applicable Box)

Adoption by the Local Governing Body:
§201.6(c)(5) **OR**

NOT MET	MET
	N/A

Multi-Jurisdictional Plan Adoption: §201.6(c)(5)
AND

Multi-Jurisdictional Planning Participation:
§201.6(a)(3)

	X
	X

Planning Process

Documentation of the Planning Process: §201.6(b)
and §201.6(c)(1)

N	S
	X

Risk Assessment

Identifying Hazards: §201.6(c)(2)(i)

Profiling Hazards: §201.6(c)(2)(i)

Assessing Vulnerability: Overview: §201.6(c)(2)(ii)

Assessing Vulnerability: Identifying Structures:
§201.6(c)(2)(ii)(A)

Assessing Vulnerability: Estimating Potential
Losses: §201.6(c)(2)(ii)(B)

Assessing Vulnerability: Analyzing Development
Trends: §201.6(c)(2)(ii)(C)

Multi-Jurisdictional Risk Assessment:
§201.6(c)(2)(iii)

N	S
	X
	X
	X
X	
X	
X	
	X

Mitigation Strategy

Local Hazard Mitigation Goals: §201.6(c)(3)(i)

Identification and Analysis of Mitigation Actions:
§201.6(c)(3)(ii)

Implementation of Mitigation Actions:
§201.6(c)(3)(iii)

Multi-Jurisdictional Mitigation Actions:
§201.6(c)(3)(iv)

N	S
	X
	X
	X
	X

Plan Maintenance Process

Monitoring, Evaluating, and Updating the Plan:
§201.6(c)(4)(i)

Incorporation into Existing Planning Mechanisms:
§201.6(c)(4)(ii)

Continued Public Involvement: §201.6(c)(4)(iii)

N	S
	X
	X
	X

LOCAL MITIGATION PLAN APPROVAL STATUS

PLAN NOT APPROVED

PLAN APPROVED

XXXXX

Reviewer's Comments

The plan was nicely done; well though out, with good data research. For the five year update, I suggest focusing on mitigation activities that are eligible for FEMA funding.

PREREQUISITE(S)

Adoption by the Local Governing Body

Requirement §201.6(c)(5): [The local hazard mitigation plan **shall** include] documentation that the plan has been formally adopted by the governing body of the jurisdiction requesting approval of the plan (e.g., City Council, County Commissioner, Tribal Council).

Element	Location in the Plan (section or annex and page #)	Reviewer's Comments	SCORE	
			NOT MET	MET
A. Has the local governing body adopted the plan?	N/A			
B. Is supporting documentation, such as a resolution, included?	N/A			
SUMMARY SCORE				N/A

Multi-Jurisdictional Plan Adoption

Requirement §201.6(c)(5): For multi-jurisdictional plans, each jurisdiction requesting approval of the plan **must** document that it has been formally adopted.

Element	Location in the Plan (section or annex and page #)	Reviewer's Comments	SCORE	
			NOT MET	MET
A. Does the plan indicate the specific jurisdictions represented in the plan?	vii	The plan delineates the Town of Wibaux and Wibaux County as the jurisdictions involved in the plan.		X
B. For each jurisdiction, has the local governing body adopted the plan?	II-3	All jurisdictions adopted the plan by resolution.		X
C. Is supporting documentation, such as a resolution, included for each participating jurisdiction?	iv-vi	The signed resolutions are included in the plan.		X
SUMMARY SCORE				X

Multi-Jurisdictional Planning Participation

Requirement §201.6(a)(3): Multi-jurisdictional plans (e.g., watershed plans) may be accepted, as appropriate, as long as each jurisdiction has participated in the process ... Statewide plans will not be accepted as multi-jurisdictional plans.

Element	Location in the Plan (section or annex and page #)	Reviewer's Comments	SCORE	
			NOT MET	MET
A. Does the plan describe how each jurisdiction participated in the plan's development?	I-4	The plan provides a summary of the planning process. This includes participant lists, which covers all of the jurisdictions involved in the planning process.		X
SUMMARY SCORE				X

PLANNING PROCESS: §201.6(b): *An open public involvement process is essential to the development of an effective plan.*

Documentation of the Planning Process

Requirement §201.6(b): *In order to develop a more comprehensive approach to reducing the effects of natural disasters, the planning process **shall** include:*

- (1) *An opportunity for the public to comment on the plan during the drafting stage and prior to plan approval;*
- (2) *An opportunity for neighboring communities, local and regional agencies involved in hazard mitigation activities, and agencies that have the authority to regulate development, as well as businesses, academia and other private and non-profit interests to be involved in the planning process; and*
- (3) *Review and incorporation, if appropriate, of existing plans, studies, reports, and technical information.*

Requirement §201.6(c)(1): *[The plan **shall** document] the planning process used to develop the plan, including how it was prepared, who was involved in the process, and how the public was involved.*

Element	Location in the Plan (section or annex and page #)	Reviewer's Comments	SCORE	
			N	S
A. Does the plan provide a narrative description of the process followed to prepare the plan?	I-4, II-1, V-2	The process is well described. The DES Coordinator and the contractor worked the effort under guidance of a Steering Committee. Agendas, summaries, sign-in sheets, and correspondence are included in the plan.		X
B. Does the plan indicate who was involved in the planning process? (For example, who led the development at the staff level and were there any external contributors such as contractors? Who participated on the plan committee, provided information, reviewed drafts, etc.?)	II 1,2; V-2	An extensive list of people of all walks of life was invited to participate in the process. A list of those people is in the document.		X
C. Does the plan indicate how the public was involved? (Was the public provided an opportunity to comment on the plan during the drafting stage and prior to the plan approval?)	II 1-3	Letters were sent to certain individuals, flyers, plus public notices were put in the paper to announce the meetings.		X
D. Was there an opportunity for neighboring communities, agencies, businesses, academia, nonprofits, and other interested parties to be involved in the planning process?	II 2-3; V 3	Several other businesses and agencies were involved in the planning process.		X
E. Does the planning process describe the review and incorporation, if appropriate, of existing plans, studies, reports, and technical information?	II 1	The plan indicates that local, state, and federal plans were reviewed and are cited throughout the plan.		X
SUMMARY SCORE				X

RISK ASSESSMENT: §201.6(c)(2): *The plan shall include a risk assessment that provides the factual basis for activities proposed in the strategy to reduce losses from identified hazards. Local risk assessments must provide sufficient information to enable the jurisdiction to identify and prioritize appropriate mitigation actions to reduce losses from identified hazards.*

Identifying Hazards

Requirement §201.6(c)(2)(i): *[The risk assessment shall include a] description of the type ... of all natural hazards that can affect the jurisdiction.*

Element	Location in the Plan (section or annex and page #)	Reviewer's Comments	SCORE	
			N	S
A. Does the plan include a description of the types of all natural hazards that affect the jurisdiction? If the hazard identification omits (without explanation) any hazards commonly recognized as threats to the jurisdiction, this part of the plan cannot receive a Satisfactory score. Consult with the State Hazard Mitigation Officer to identify applicable hazards that may occur in the planning area.	III 3-17	<p>They did a good job of identifying and explaining their hazards. Each hazard profile provides a good description of the hazard potentially impacting the county.</p> <p>The plan includes information for all identified hazards and in most cases the data used is more extensive than that found from readily available on-line resources. For more information refer to SHELDUS (www.sheldus.org).</p> <p>A Flood Insurance Study is available for Wibaux County and incorporated towns. Refer to http://msc.fema.gov/ for more information.</p> <p>The plan does not appear to discuss dams within Wibaux County. The National Inventory of Dams (NID) indicates that there are 14 dams in Wibaux County and all of them are low hazard dams. The National Dam Safety Act requires that an emergency action plan (EAP) be completed for high hazard. Since all the dams in Wibaux appear to be low hazard, an EAP is not required. Please see http://crunch.tec.army.mil/nid/webpages/nid.cfm (introduction and download dam data) for National Dam Inventory information.</p> <p>Online EPA data suggests that there are no reported toxic release inventory sites in Wibaux County. Please see http://www.epa.gov/triexplorer/ for more information.</p>		X
SUMMARY SCORE				X

Profiling Hazards

Requirement §201.6(c)(2)(i): *[The risk assessment shall include a] description of the ... location and extent of all natural hazards that can affect the jurisdiction. The plan shall include information on previous occurrences of hazard events and on the probability of future hazard events.*

Element	Location in the Plan (section or annex and page #)	Reviewer's Comments	SCORE	
			N	S
A. Does the risk assessment identify the location (i.e., geographic area affected) of each natural hazard addressed in the plan?	III 3-17 CWPP V 5-10	Each hazard profile includes a section on Historical occurrences, which identifies the location of past occurrences. The plan also includes maps for drought, flood, and fire, which depict the areas at risk. In addition the plan discusses the general locations of the identified hazards in the opening paragraph under each hazard. The CWPP goes into even further detail of location affected including individual community assessments and ignition profiles. In addition the plan includes excellent maps, which help to identify the locations at risk		X
B. Does the risk assessment identify the extent (i.e., magnitude or severity) of each hazard addressed in the plan?	III 3-17 CWPP V 5-10	The magnitudes and severity of each hazard was well documented. The magnitude of past events is highlighted in the hazard profiles. Loss estimates and associated costs are included when applicable. The CWPP discusses historical occurrences of fires and associated land loss on page V-5. Recommended Revisions for the Five Year Update: It may be helpful to develop a summary table for all identified hazards that lists location of hazard, date, time, magnitude, death, injuries, property damage and crop damage.		X
C. Does the plan provide information on previous occurrences of each hazard addressed in the plan?	III 3-17 CWPP V 5-10	The historical perspectives presented gave a very good picture of the threats that the county has.		X
D. Does the plan include the probability of future events (i.e., chance of occurrence) for each hazard addressed in the plan?	III 3-17 CWPP V 5-10	Marginally met. Each hazard described shows the historical perspective and also a small amount of information describing future potential for damage. The CWPP provides qualitative probability (i.e. medium) for fire occurrence under the "Assessment of Risk" section. Recommended Revisions for the Five Year Update: If the statistical probability of a hazard event is not known, provide a qualitative probability of its occurrence (e.g., low, medium, high) for all identified hazards. Describe the methodology or sources used to determine the probability for each natural hazard. Note any data limitations for profiling hazards and include in the mitigation strategy actions for collecting the data to complete and improve future risk analysis efforts. For more information on profiling hazards, see <i>Understanding Your Risks</i> (FEMA 386-2), Step 2.		X
SUMMARY SCORE				X

Assessing Vulnerability: Overview

Requirement §201.6(c)(2)(ii): *[The risk assessment **shall** include a] description of the jurisdiction's vulnerability to the hazards described in paragraph (c)(2)(i) of this section. This description **shall** include an overall summary of each hazard and its impact on the community.*

Element	Location in the Plan (section or annex and page #)	Reviewer's Comments	SCORE	
			N	S
A. Does the plan include an overall summary description of the jurisdiction's vulnerability to each hazard?	III 3-17 CWPP V 5-11	The plan does a nice job of summarizing the data. Each identified hazard includes a section on "Vulnerability and Potential Loss Estimates", which discuss the jurisdiction vulnerability to each hazard in great detail. Historical occurrences are included, which also express the jurisdictions vulnerability. In addition, critical facilities and vulnerable populations are discussed on pages III-18-19. The CWPP does a good job at discussing vulnerability in relation to fire hazards, including: individual community assessments, future development, vegetation types, and potential dollar losses.		X
B. Does the plan address the impact of each hazard on the jurisdiction?	III 3-17 CWPP V 5-11	The impacts are clearly identified. The hazard profiles identify past occurrences related to location and costs when applicable. The CWPP includes extensive information on the impacts from wildfire on individual communities, including: land use, structures, and vulnerable populations.		X
SUMMARY SCORE				X

Assessing Vulnerability: Identifying Structures

Requirement §201.6(c)(2)(ii)(A): *The plan **should** describe vulnerability in terms of the types and numbers of existing and future buildings, infrastructure, and critical facilities located in the identified hazard area ...*

Element	Location in the Plan (section or annex and page #)	Reviewer's Comments	SCORE	
			N	S
A. Does the plan describe vulnerability in terms of the types and numbers of existing buildings, infrastructure, and critical facilities located in the identified hazard areas?	III 18 CWPP V 5-6	Note: A "Needs Improvement" score on this requirement will not preclude the plan from passing. The plan includes a list of critical facilities, which are separated by jurisdiction, although the plan does not include the type of buildings i.e. residential, commercial etc. and there is no connection to the hazard areas. The CWPP discusses existing buildings in general terms within the Individual Community Assessment section. Recommended Revisions for the Five Year Update: For each hazard, identify the type and number of existing buildings, infrastructure, and critical facilities within each hazard area.	X	

<p>B. Does the plan describe vulnerability in terms of the types and numbers of future buildings, infrastructure, and critical facilities located in the identified hazard areas?</p>	<p>III 18</p>	<p>Note: A “Needs Improvement” score on this requirement will not preclude the plan from passing.</p> <p>No mention of future buildings is included in the plan. The plan indicates that no new construction is proposed.</p> <p>Recommended Revisions:</p> <p>For each hazard identify the type and number of future buildings, infrastructure, and critical facilities within each hazard area. Even though no new construction is proposed, indicate where development should occur when considering identified hazards.</p> <p>Additional Suggestions:</p> <p>Identify the types of buildings (e.g., residential, commercial, institutional, recreational, industrial, and municipal buildings), infrastructure (e.g., roadways, bridges, utilities, and communications systems), and critical facilities (e.g., shelters, hospitals, police, and fire stations).</p> <p>Information on proposed buildings, infrastructure, and critical facilities, including planned and approved development, may be based on information in the comprehensive or land use plan and zoning maps.</p>	<p>X</p>	
SUMMARY SCORE			<p>X</p>	

Assessing Vulnerability: Estimating Potential Losses

Requirement §201.6(c)(2)(ii)(B): [The plan **should** describe vulnerability in terms of an] estimate of the potential dollar losses to vulnerable structures identified in paragraph (c)(2)(i)(A) of this section and a description of the methodology used to prepare the estimate

Element	Location in the Plan (section or annex and page #)	Reviewer's Comments	SCORE	
			N	S
A. Does the plan estimate potential dollar losses to vulnerable structures?	III 18 CWPP V 14	<p>Note: A "Needs Improvement" score on this requirement will not preclude the plan from passing.</p> <p>The plan discusses loss estimations for land and economics in the hazard profiles. In addition page III-8 list critical facilities and the value of each facility.</p> <p>The CWPP discuss the potential dollar losses to infrastructure, which is listed on page V-14.</p>		X
B. Does the plan describe the methodology used to prepare the estimate?	III 18	<p>Note: A "Needs Improvement" score on this requirement will not preclude the plan from passing.</p> <p>The plan does not include the methodology used to prepare the estimates. Page III-18 indicates that the list of critical facilities was developed by the steering committee and sources are provided, although there does not appear to be a discussion on the methodology used.</p> <p>The CWPP discusses that a wildfire scenario was developed to estimate the potential losses.</p> <p>Recommended Revisions:</p> <p>Describe the methodology used to estimate losses in the mitigation plan.</p> <p>For a step-by-step method for estimating losses, see <i>Understanding Your Risks</i> (FEMA 386-2), Step 4.</p>	X	
SUMMARY SCORE			X	

Assessing Vulnerability: Analyzing Development Trends

Requirement §201.6(c)(2)(ii)(C): [The plan **should** describe vulnerability in terms of] providing a general description of land uses and development trends within the community so that mitigation options can be considered in future land use decisions.

Element	Location in the Plan (section or annex and page #)	Reviewer's Comments	SCORE	
			N	S
A. Does the plan describe land uses and development trends?	I 4-6 CWPP V 6-14	<p>Note: A "Needs Improvement" score on this requirement will not preclude the plan from passing.</p> <p>Land use and development trends are discussed in great detail in Section 1 pages 4-6, although the discussion does not make a connection to identified hazards.</p> <p>The CWPP discuss land uses and development trends in great detail on pages V-6-14 and all are in relation to fire hazards.</p> <p>Recommended Revisions:</p> <p>Please provide a discussion on land use and potential future projects in relation to hazard areas, so mitigation options can be considered in future land use decisions.</p>	X	
SUMMARY SCORE			X	

Multi-Jurisdictional Risk Assessment

Requirement §201.6(c)(2)(iii): For multi-jurisdictional plans, the risk assessment **must** assess each jurisdiction's risks where they vary from the risks facing the entire planning area.

Element	Location in the Plan (section or annex and page #)	Reviewer's Comments	SCORE	
			N	S
A. Does the plan include a risk assessment for each participating jurisdiction as needed to reflect unique or varied risks?	vii CWPP V 5-13	<p>The plan discusses the participating jurisdictions' varied risk in general terms, on page vii. The plan states that the town has risk exposure to four of the hazards identified and the County has risk exposure to all five hazards. The CWPP includes good information in regards to varied risk on pages V-5-V-13.</p> <p>Recommended Revision for the Five Year Update:</p> <p>Prepare a summary of the various jurisdictions that describe only the risks that vary among identified jurisdictions.</p>		X
SUMMARY SCORE				X

MITIGATION STRATEGY: §201.6(c)(3): *The plan shall include a mitigation strategy that provides the jurisdiction's blueprint for reducing the potential losses identified in the risk assessment, based on existing authorities, policies, programs and resources, and its ability to expand on and improve these existing tools.*

Local Hazard Mitigation Goals

Requirement §201.6(c)(3)(i): *[The hazard mitigation strategy **shall** include a] description of mitigation goals to reduce or avoid long-term vulnerabilities to the identified hazards.*

Element	Location in the Plan (section or annex and page #)	Reviewer's Comments	SCORE	
			N	S
A Does the plan include a description of mitigation goals to reduce or avoid long-term vulnerabilities to the identified hazards? (GOALS are long-term; represent what the community wants to achieve, such as "eliminate flood damage"; and are based on the risk assessment findings.)	vii; IV 2-3 CWPP V 17-18	Five goals are identified in the plan. The CWPP also lists a set of goals.		X
SUMMARY SCORE				X

Identification and Analysis of Mitigation Actions

Requirement §201.6(c)(3)(ii): *[The mitigation strategy **shall** include a] section that identifies and analyzes a comprehensive range of specific mitigation actions and projects being considered to reduce the effects of each hazard, with particular emphasis on new and existing buildings and infrastructure.*

Element	Location in the Plan (section or annex and page #)	Reviewer's Comments	SCORE	
			N	S
A. Does the plan identify and analyze a comprehensive range of specific mitigation actions and projects for each hazard?	vii; IV 2-3 CWPP V 17-18	The plan does identify and analyze a broad range of actions. However, even though they are important to the county, most are Preparedness and Response type actions. Recommendations for the five year update: If the county wishes to compete for "mitigation" funding, they should identify projects that are eligible for those funds. A discussion with the State Hazard Mitigation Officer might clarify what those are.		X
B Do the identified actions and projects address reducing the effects of hazards on new buildings and infrastructure?	IV 2-3 CWPP V 17-18	Although the majority of projects are in relation to preparedness and not mitigation, there are a few projects that may help to reduce the effects on new buildings such as, create defensible space, offer information on building materials and techniques for wind resistant new construction and educate the public.		X
C. Do the identified actions and projects address reducing the effects of hazards on existing buildings and infrastructure?	IV 2-3 CWPP V 17-18	The plan appears to include two projects that would protect existing buildings, which is to educate the public and create defensible space around private homes.		X
SUMMARY SCORE				X

Implementation of Mitigation Actions

Requirement: §201.6(c)(3)(iii): *[The mitigation strategy section **shall** include] an action plan describing how the actions identified in section (c)(3)(ii) will be prioritized, implemented, and administered by the local jurisdiction. Prioritization **shall** include a special emphasis on the extent to which benefits are maximized according to a cost benefit review of the proposed projects and their associated costs.*

Element	Location in the Plan (section or annex and page #)	Reviewer's Comments	SCORE	
			N	S
A. Does the mitigation strategy include how the actions are prioritized ? (For example, is there a discussion of the process and criteria used?)	IV 4 CWPP V 19	The participants at the final meeting prioritized the projects. These were ranked high, medium, and low, based on established criteria.		X
B. Does the mitigation strategy address how the actions will be implemented and administered ? (For example, does it identify the responsible department, existing and potential resources, and timeframe?)	IV 5-7 CWPP V 20-21	The plan provides a good description of who, what, when and how much.		X
C. Does the prioritization process include an emphasis on the use of a cost-benefit review (see page 3-36 of <i>Multi-Hazard Mitigation Planning Guidance</i>) to maximize benefits?	IV 6-7	All of the projects were reviewed from a cost/benefit perspective, using a matrix that showed high medium and low. More actual estimates of project costs and detail, would enhance and substantiate that claim.		X
SUMMARY SCORE				X

Multi-Jurisdictional Mitigation Actions

Requirement §201.6(c)(3)(iv): *For multi-jurisdictional plans, there **must** be identifiable action items specific to the jurisdiction requesting FEMA approval or credit of the plan.*

Element	Location in the Plan (section or annex and page #)	Reviewer's Comments	SCORE	
			N	S
A Does the plan include at least one identifiable action item for each jurisdiction requesting FEMA approval of the plan?	IV 4-5 CWPP V 19	Each jurisdiction has at least one action identified.		X
SUMMARY SCORE				X

PLAN MAINTENANCE PROCESS

Monitoring, Evaluating, and Updating the Plan

Requirement §201.6(c)(4)(i): *[The plan maintenance process shall include a] section describing the method and schedule of monitoring, evaluating, and updating the mitigation plan within a five-year cycle.*

Element	Location in the Plan (section or annex and page #)	Reviewer's Comments	SCORE	
			N	S
A. Does the plan describe the method and schedule for monitoring the plan? (For example, does it identify the party responsible for monitoring and include a schedule for reports, site visits, phone calls, and meetings?)	VI 1-2 CWPP V 20-21	The Wibaux County Commissioners will be responsible for ensuring that the plan is kept current and for evaluating its effectiveness. The DES coordinator and the LEPC will be co-leads.		X
B. Does the plan describe the method and schedule for evaluating the plan? (For example, does it identify the party responsible for evaluating the plan and include the criteria used to evaluate the plan?)	VI 1-2 CWPP V 20-21	The Wibaux County Commissioners will be responsible for ensuring that the plan is evaluated for effectiveness. The County DES coordinator and the LEPC will be co-leads.		X
C. Does the plan describe the method and schedule for updating the plan within the five-year cycle?	VI 1-2 CWPP V 20-21	The plan will be updated when any of the following three triggers occur: major natural disaster, time, and change in federal regulations. The plan will be updated every five years beginning in 2010. The plan will first be submitted to the Montana DES and then to FEMA for approval.		X
SUMMARY SCORE				X

Incorporation into Existing Planning Mechanisms

Requirement §201.6(c)(4)(ii): *[The plan shall include a] process by which local governments incorporate the requirements of the mitigation plan into other planning mechanisms such as comprehensive or capital improvement plans, when appropriate.*

Element	Location in the Plan (section or annex and page #)	Reviewer's Comments	SCORE	
			N	S
A. Does the plan identify other local planning mechanisms available for incorporating the requirements of the mitigation plan?	VI 2	The plan indicates that the PDM will be incorporated into the interoperable communications plan.		X
B. Does the plan include a process by which the local government will incorporate the requirements in other plans, when appropriate?	VI 2	The County DES coordinator will see that any relevant information be referenced in the communications plan.		X
SUMMARY SCORE				X

Continued Public Involvement

Requirement §201.6(c)(4)(iii): *[The plan maintenance process **shall** include a] discussion on how the community will continue public participation in the plan maintenance process.*

Element	Location in the Plan (section or annex and page #)	Reviewer's Comments	SCORE	
			N	S
A. Does the plan explain how continued public participation will be obtained? (For example, will there be public notices, an on-going mitigation plan committee, or annual review meetings with stakeholders?)	VI 1-2	The plan indicates that the LEPC will meet to review the plan and the meeting will be open to the public and announced in the Wibaux Pioneer.		X
SUMMARY SCORE				X